DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 122 CG 019 886

AUTHOR Stimpson, Catharine R.
TITLE Our "Wild Patience": Our Energetic Deeds, Our Energizing Future. Working Paper No. 158.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 25p.
AVAILABLE FROM Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($3.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Females; Feminism; Higher Education; *Research Needs; *Sex Differences; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

The Wellesley College Center for Research on Women represents a triumph of women's studies. Women's studies have sought a particular ethic, valuing the moral equality of those who seek education and of those who offer it. Women's studies have sought to alter institutions so that they embody such an ethic and to change the consciousness of both individuals and institutions. It is necessary for those involved in women's studies to maintain the power they have gained and, at the same time, to retain the perspectives of the outsider. Women's studies outside the United States can offer new approaches to child care, to women's collective action, and to doing research about women. There are several questions that women's studies must now confront. These include determining what women's studies are looking at and doing, and examining the causes, nature, and extent of sex differences. Two major attitudes toward sex differences exist. The first is the minimalist attitude which realizes that sex differences exist but goes on to claim that historical forces have largely determined these dissimilarities. The second is the maximalist attitude which proposes that deep, transcultural forces create many sex differences and that the link between biological "sex" and social "gender" is profound. Both of these positions require further study. Because women's studies still meet opposition, another future task of women's studies is to overcome that opposition. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG 019886

OUR "WILD PATIENCE:" OUR ENERGETIC DEEDS, OUR ENERGIZING FUTURE

Catherine R. Stimpson

1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Catherine Stimpson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WORKING PAPER
NO. 158

Wellesley College
Center for Research on Women
Wellesley, MA 02181

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Our 'Wild Patience:'
Our Energetic Deeds, Our Energizing Future"
Keynote Address: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women
Tenth Anniversary Celebration, May 23, 1985

Let us begin with simple truths. The 10th Anniversary of the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women is well worth celebrating. This Center -- this gathering of imagination, scholarly scrupulousness, and leadership -- deserves our public praise. Neither luck nor chance have sustained its labors. On the contrary. Hard,human work and devotion; hard,human endurance and energy, have nurtured its accomplishments. In her poem, "Integrity," Adrienne Rich begins:

"A wild patience has taken me this far" [1]

Tonight, we honor the wild patience of this place, and its people.

My peculiar form of homage is an act of pedantry. The Wellesley Center is one of the triumphs of women's studies, the vast endeavor that is irrevocably altering what we know and think

about women and gender. I wish to explore the boundaries, and the horizon, this endeavor. I will first note what some of our deeds have been; what some of the memories are -- on which we can draw. Then, I will suggest what some of our deeds might be -- on which the future might count.

Since 1969, women's studies has persistently, insistently, said that change was necessary, desirable, and possible. [2] The calls for change have never had the chordal discipline of the chorale, nor the close harmonies of the barber shop quartet. Rather, they have been a series of improvisations and set pieces -- for both solo voices and ensemble groups. Nevertheless, the calls for changes have had at least three dominant themes.

First, women's studies has sought (that verb form that combines the words "see" and "ought," vision and moral imperative) a particular ethic. This ethic values the moral equality of those who seek education and of those who offer it. Women's studies has promised that an ethic of equality will enhance education, not smash it to pieces. [3] In general, women's studies has always had ethical concerns, even ethical passions. The fact that 1 child in 5 in the United States now lives in poverty seems, to most women's studies practioners, a fact, and an immoral fact.

Implicit in the ethic of moral equality, with its liberal faith in the individual, is a further belief: that each of us can be the first witness to our own experience. As we construct a mature sense of reality, we begin with our own perceptions and histories. We are active participants in the process of the construction of a mature sense of reality, not passive recipients

of higher truths from higher orders. Such a process insures us our due.

Second, women's studies has sought to alter institutions so that they embody such an ethic. We have asked them to act affirmatively. In our ambition, we have asked institutions to do another thing as well: to incorporate, to "mainstream," the new scholarship about women into their ordinary curriculum. Zora Neale Hurston, we have said, belongs in Afro-American Studies programs, in women's studies programs, and in American Literature courses. [4]

Simultaneously, we have assumed that we can best work for change if we have our own institutions, our own Wellesley Centers, that make women's interests their first interest. The new scholarship about women has fortified this conviction. For research seems to suggest that some women's institutions, of some sort, are imperative if history is to march, slither, and struggle towards gender equity. In brief, women's studies has needed both the educational equivalent of a fission process, in which it has created its own settings, and of a fusion process, in which it has become a part of other settings. The two processes have complementary, not competing, virtues.

Third, women's studies has sought to change consciousness -- that of individuals and that of institutions. This has meant more than occasionally referring to a specific woman -- to a Queen Elizabeth I or an Abigail Adams. This has even meant more than occasionally referring to women as a group -- to elite women or to our Founding Mothers. It has meant a constant, serious, deepening awareness of sets of problems and ideas about women. Among those

problems and ideas have been the pernicious existence of sexual stratification and discrimination; the peculiarities and triumphs of the representation of women, by men and women alike; the relationship of public and domestic worlds; the causes, nature, and extent of sexual difference; and the profound differences among women themselves. My maternal grandmother, for example, was a servant, for a farmer and his wife, when she was twelve. I, obviously, was not. I was a bike-riding, book-reading, Hollywood-mad 7th-grader.

Urging on these three changes, women's studies has grown -- both as a cross-disciplinary endeavor and as a part of those fragmented and often rivalry-ridden siblings, the contemporary academic disciplines. I am American enough to cheer growth -- at least in some industries. Since 1969, in America alone, at least 50 center of research about women have appeared; at least 30,000 courses; perhaps 500 degree-granting programs. It is now difficult, if not impossible, to have the polymath who can recite all the citations about women -- from anthropology to zoology.

In its growth, women's studies has become, fortunately, more heterogeneous. Bold programs for the study of women of color are documenting how various the lives of women have been. Those programs, which many in women's studies have both consciously welcomed and unconsciously resisted, are necessary in and of themselves. In addition, they are nurturing a virtue that all of American education must respect. As we know, American students are becoming more diverse. By 1990, "groups currently designated as

minorities in the educational system will represent 30 percent of the youth cohort nationwide..." They will be 45 percent of the public high school graduates in Texas and California; 32 percent in New York; 28 percent in New Jersey. [5] They will deserve an education that gives them -- not only the survival skills we all must have today -- but a grasp of the realities of all of the many peoples that people our society.

What if research and teaching about women were to be among the first genuinely to embody the experiences of all of us? What if research and teaching about women could bring together the realities of the peoples of an entire people? All colors? All classes? All sexualities? All powers? Both genders? What if women's studies were to show what a conceptual democracy really might be like? What if women's studies were to serve as a laboratory for a heterogeneous community? It would be wonderful, but it will not be without studies of women of color; without women of color.

Increasing the heterogeneity of women's studies is the fact that several generations of scholars have joined those crazed pioneers who, in the 1960s, took women as a subject "...in a material and local world." [6] For the students and researchers who have followed the crazed pioneers, women's studies is not a brand-new thing to do. Rather, it is an activity that has already begun. Dissertation Abstracts already lists hundreds of theses about women and gender. As Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, a founder of women's history, has recently written:

"...it is easy to forget the spirit of those early years.

Nor have younger scholars just becoming aware of women's history any way of knowing the fervor we brought to our task or with what elation and camaraderie we turned to each other." [7]

The newer generations, then, are revising knowledge as usual. This includes the founding axioms of women's studies and the study of women within specific disciplines. Literary critics, for example, are supplementing the concept of "gynocritics" with that of "gynesis." [8] Anthropologists and historians are debating the practice of separating social reality into two spheres: one his, one hers. In brief, women's studies, which began as a profound corrective, now itself demands corrections. I hope that the correctors are generous and smart, and that the corrected are, in turn, kindly and gracious.

The presence of several generations is one sign of the decreasing fragility and the increasing strength of women's studies. At least three widely-dispersed, general metaphors for power are now common: <u>the circle, or field,</u> in which the powerful are in the center, and the less powerful scattered towards the edges; <u>the ladder,</u> in which the powerful occupy the top rung, and the less powerful the lower ones; and, finally, <u>the car,</u> in which the powerful are in the driver's seat, and the less powerful in the passenger seats, in the trunk, or on the running boards and bumpers. Women's studies is closer to the center, to the top, and to the steering wheel than it was in 1969, or 1974. One of our tasks, then, is to maintain the security of the powers we have gained so arduously. Powerlessness is no fun. Who, after all, would not prefer winning tenure to losing it? Who would not prefer having a

budget line to not having one? Who would not prefer being published to being silently garretted? Who would not prefer having a research center in a house rather than an attic? An attic to no research center at all?

The expansion of the powers of women's studies is inseparable from the augmentation of the number of women in the academy. To be sure, being female has never guaranteed doing feminist things. Nor has being an educator. Today, no land-grant university, no Ivy League university, has a woman president. Nevertheless, higher education welcomes women more ebulliently than it did during the 1960s. Let me offer an exemplary dream -- from an Associate Professor of Classics in a private Southern university. After nearly a decade of work, she finished her book on Vergil. To understand that Latin epic, she used a philosophical text: The Human Condition. One night, after she put her children to bed and went to sleep, she had a dream. She was shopping. She saw a designer dress, on sale, for $46.52. The designer was, neither Klein nor Kenzo, but Hannah Arendt. One may interpret this dream as one will. I read it as the integration of women's traditional roles with scholarship. [9]

Yet, women's studies cannot afford to lose the insights that marginality and alienation offer as rueful compensation for their pain. In A Room of One's Own, in a taut meditation about consciousness, Virginia Woolf thinks about being a woman, walking down Whitehall, at the center of what was once an imperial power. "...one is often surprised," she writes, "...by a sudden splitting off of consciousness...when from being the natural inheritor of

that civilisation, she becomes, on the contrary, outside of it, alien and critical." [10]

But how does one maintain some power and retain the perspectives of the outsider? How does one do this balancing act? Surely one way is to be wary of the sneaky suzerainty of the unconscious. Such a wariness reminds us that our conscious ideas and actions have their hidden motives and disguised compulsions. Another way, in the domain of consciousness, is to guarantee that new voices re/sound through women's studies. Crucially, women studies in the United States can connect even more systematically with women's studies outside of the United States. -- whether or not those efforts call themselves "women's studies." In the mid-1970s, the Wellesley Center's Conference on Women and National Development, like the United Nations Conferences during the Decade of Women, helped to initiate this process.

Obviously, women's studies outside of the United States has more to do than to teach women's studies to the United States. If we adopt the role of dependent student, we will be lazy and self-pitying. Nevertheless, if we are willing to learn, women's studies outside of the United States has much to teach us. It can challenge our affluent, but tacky, provincialism. It can offer approaches that the United States has not yet tried to such policy questions as child-care; to such social and political questions as the best forms of women's collective action; and to such methodological questions as the most useful ways of doing research about women. Especially in the developing countries, where poverty is so vast and vile, women's studies must investigate literacy as

well as higher education; rice-milling technologies as well as household appliances; water supplies as well as information retrieval and data banks. As a result, most projects bind research to social action even more closely than the United States does.

Finally, women's studies outside of the United States can repudiate loftier United States generalizations about women as a globally common group. Of course, women's lives do mirror each other. In country after country, women are victims of domestic violence; sexual control; illiteracy; labor exploitation; and the growing pauperization of women. In country after country, they are also responsible for basic survival needs -- for preparing food, water, milk. Women are responsible for offering the breast, the back, and the knee. Perhaps if one question can bring researchers about women together, it is that of basic survival. How are we to free ourselves of hunger, thirst, sapping illness, and the threat of nuclear death?

Yet, women within the United States differ amongst themselves -- by race, class, political convictions, religion, region, sexual preference, and temperament. So, too, do women around the world differ from each other. Women's studies must understand those differences, that heterogeneity. For example, women's studies outside of the United States can remind United States women that they may suffer from sexism. Nevertheless, United States women also have privileges as comparatively free citizens of a country that takes such a vigorous, armored interest in international relations.

In the collaboration and collision of women's studies in the

United States and abroad, women's studies will become, intellectually, a bountifully contested zone. Indeed, women's studies can be a model of what can grow in an open intellectual field. That contest will help to nurture the efforts of women's studies to maintain its powers and retain the perspectives of outsiders. Aiding this effort to balance the newly-established and the new is the labyrinthian nature of the questions that women's studies must now confront. They are demanding enough to guarantee that women's studies will be as volatile as any enterprise of consciousness.

I will not give a encyclopedic list of these questions; these demands. However, I will mention some entries on my list. The first, which seems to be the most arcane, may be among the most nagging. It asks what women's studies is doing; what women's studies is looking at, guarding and regarding. Some say that we should first understand women: their histories, culture, labor, and habits. [11] That vantage point can then help us see the rest of history and society. No, say others. We must first understand gender: the economic, social, familial, and psychological architecture of femininity and masculinity. We must connect the lives of men and women, we must decipher the patterns of behavior that men and women, <u>as men and women,</u> learn, act out and on. and That vantage point can then help us fit gender into other social structures -- like those of class -- that organize culture and society. [12] If this dialogue seems like a distinction without a difference; more nutty academic nit-picking, imagine what it might mean to change the name of the Wellesley Center for

Research on Women to the Wellesley Center for Research on Gender.

No matter what the vantage point, women's studies will continue to struggle with the causes, nature, and extent of sex differences. In the past, I have isolated two major attitudes towards sex differences. The first, and more pervasive, is that of the "minimalists." The minimalists realize that men and women have dissimilar bodies; work; life spans; speech patterns; and powers. However, minimalists go on, historical forces have largely determined these dissimilarities. Neither cosmic spirits nor hormones have mattered as much. If we were but to change historical conditions, and conditioning, most sex differences would become obsolete. In science fiction, Ursula LeGuin's novel, The Left-Hand of Darkness (1969) explores this vision; in literary criticism, Carolyn Heilbrun's Towards A Recognition of Androgyny (1973). Not surprisingly, a sociologist, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, most recently stated the "minimalist view:"

"On the basis of current research, the biological differences between men and women have little or no relevance to their behavior and capacities apart from their sexual and reproductive roles; even the effects of early gender socialization may be reversed by adult experiences. A growing body of knowledge indicates that, under the same conditions, men and women show similar competence, talent, ambition, and desire in activities that range from running races to doing scientific research. That conditions vary so regularly and decisively for men and women has more to do with divisions of power in society than with innate sex differences." [13]

The second attitude is that of the "maximalists." They propose that deep, transcultural forces create many sex differences; that the link between sex, a biological condition, and gender, a social creation, is far more profound that the easy-going "minimalists" believe. Traditionally, the belief in sex differences has joined with and ratified a commitment to hierarchies of power within the family, community, and state. Think of St. Paul and Charles Darwin. However, the "maximalists" are also feminists. Their politics unites a theory of sexual difference to a commitment to gender equity within family, community, and state. To oversimplify, a "minimalist" stresses sexual similarities between men and women as a theoretical basis for gender equity. A "maximalist" stresses the novel possibility of using sexual dissimilarities as a theoretical basis for gender equity. [14] How this latter position might embed itself in law and everyday life is still murky.

Speaking up for the "maximalist" position are some unusual allies: American social science; French gender theory, which revisionary psychoanalysis has influenced; and American radical feminism and lesbian theory. More and more outspoken, the "maximalists" divide against each other. At least four "maximal" positions have emerged. As they have done so, in the 1970s, "female" characteristics have assumed more and more grandeur.

The first claims that differences between men and women exist. The cause is unclear. Because female characteristics have value, we tamper with sex differences gingerly. I think, for example, of Carol Gilligan's famously famous work on moral reasoning. I

think, too, of Alice Walker's lyrical definition of "womanist." The womanist is first a "black feminist or feminist of color," but she is also: "A woman who loves other women, sexually and/or nonsexually. Appreciates and prefers women's culture, women's emotional flexibility...and women's strength. Sometimes loves individual men, sexually and/or nonsexually. Committed to survival and wholeness of entire people, male and female. Not a separatist, except periodically, for health." [15]

Interestingly, some "socially conservative" women also believe in strong sex differences; in deep gender markings. They often fear gender change because they assume men will then evade their "male" responsibilities, while women will lose their "female" role without any acceptable alternatives. To them, feminism destroys the reliabilities of gender, and then, heedlessly and headlessly, passes on. [16] Traditional sex differences mean security.

A second position claims that differences between men and women exist. The cause is evolution. Because the cause is so immense, we tamper with sex differences gingerly. I think, for example, of Alice Rossi's theories, which partially elect the body as a legislator of social relations. [17]

The third claims that differences between men and women exist. The causes lie in our bodies, our sexual capacities, and that fraught, gender-marked relationship between mother and child. Because female characteristics have value (in women's language, for example), and because the causes are so immense, we tamper with sex differences gingerly. Indeed, we may encourage them. I think, for example, of French calls for "écriture féminine." [18]

A fourth claims that differences between men and women have existed in history. The cause is reproductive capacities. However, history is severing the link, first for men, now for women, between biological, reproductive self and social roles. The scholar ought to be a maximalist in examining the past; a minimalist in examining the present. I think, for example, of Mary Hartman's ideas about the development of gender roles in the West. 19

Frankly, I am an unregenerate minimalist who learns from the maximalists. The unresolved debate between the two groups is intellectually and politically significant. For many people hope that the discovery of deep differences between men and women, lying beneath the seas of history like tectonic plates, will explain why and how the experiences of men and women have been so different as they have ridden through those waters. However, I am wary, in the late 1980s, of too excessive an infatuation with this particular debate. The relationship between nature and nurture, biology and culture, is surely too complex, subtle, and dynamic to admit of any precise and final measurement. To define that relationship is like weighing air with broken balloons. Then, too, to speculate too much about sexual difference, about what is "female" and what is "male" is to recapitulate that old error of thought: dualizing the world; dividing it into rigid sets of binary oppositions, and then insisted that these sets stamp out our identities. Surely, one of our great challenges is to rethink the world -- not as a monolithic blob; not a a set of dualities; but as multiplicity of heterogeneous identities and groups, as a

dazzling display of others and otherness. [20]

Certainly, in the next decade, women's studies has before it a dazzling display of mysteries, both old and new, that compel our attention. In more sober terms, women's studies has a research agenda. This agenda begins with the body and becomes bigger and bigger until it touchs the spirit itself. It starts at the point of the body,and then moves outward, in ever-expanding circles. Let me rehearse it now:

First, the most obvious differences between men and women are those of the body, of sexuality. However, sexuality means several things. It can mean eros, desire. What is the nature of female sexuality? Is it the construct of an exploitative male culture, or is it a source of a rebellious pleasure? What provokes and gratifies that pleasure? Can it include a self-chosen sadism or masochism? A delight in pornography? [21] Sexuality can also mean motherhood, reproduction. Psychologically, what does it matter, as Nancy Chodorow and others have asked, that mothers mother? Psychologically and socially, who else but women can mother? Who are the new fathers? The new care-takers? Socially and economically, what are we to think of the new technologies of birth? Who will devise and profit from them? Socially and politically, who will control women's bodies -- their sexuality? their maternity?

Next, our body is only part of our identity, of the self. How are femininity and masculinity designed, built, and kept going? Moreover, what do we mean by the "self"? Women's studies has tended to believe in the Cartesian ego, in the autonomous self.

It has wanted women to claim the potencies of the Cartesian ego, the autonomous self. However, what if post-structural thought is correct? What is that entity is an illusion? What if the self is nothing but the consequence of the discourse of the moment? What if we are nothing but the language our time has taught us to speak? If it inevitably masters us, not we it?

Next, the self is only part of larger secular structures. Educationally, what practices work best for all women? How much is education a force for equality? Economically, what should women's work be like? What should its rewards be? How should the discriminatory injustices of the market be judged and erased? What should the economic position be of those who are not in the public labor force? Women and children on welfare? The home-maker? Politically, what must we do to obtain equality -- if that is possible? What are the mechanisms that drive the vile machinery of domination? Can we trust that sacred monster, the modern state, to control that machinery, or is the modern state the most dangerous machine of all? Does modernization free? Enslave? Or both? Culturally, who will speak for and about women? Who will re/member and re/present them? Familially, What is emerging? Whom does it serve?

Finally, secular structures may only be part of vaster cosmographies. In the past, women's studies has been a greatly secular enterprise. However, some scholars and some cultural feminists have asked two questions: 1) Historically, what have been the relationships of theology, the church, and women? Have churchs maimed, or saved, or both? For black women in the United

States, for example, the church could be a source of political and religious salvation. 2) How might we reconcile gender equality with a sense of the sacred that gives meaning to birth, life, and death? With a sense of something-beyond-ourselves that sanctifies us? Shall we believe in polytheistic goddesses? Shall we be "radical monotheists"? [22]

In the next decade, organized religions will bring even greater pressures to bear on various societies and on the women in them. Popes, priests, preachers, and mullahs will demand conformity with their interpretations of sacred texts. For an array of reasons, some women will find conformity comforting. At the same time, the quest, by men and women, for a source of significance beyond history, beyond culture, is intensifying. Many people wish to transcend the profane. These two efforts -- the pressure of organized religions, the quest for significance beyond history -- may reinforce each other. They may also collide, as they do for many contemporary Catholic women. Women's studies, not simply feminist theologicians, must understand this reinforcement, and this collision.

Despite the spaciousness of such questions; despite the scrupulousness of our answers, women's studies still meets opposition. In the 1970s, the most common responses, other than a vulgar ignorance, were those tiresome, and tiring, charges that women's studies was trivial; that women's studies was a fad; that women's studies was polemical; that only dolts did women's studies. Intriguingly, some of those dolts have gone on to garner prizes, as Suzanne Lebsock, the historian, did this year when she

won the Bancroft Prize in American History for her study of women in a Virginia town. The institutional events at which such responses were perhaps most destructive were faculty tenure decisions.

In the 1980s, as women's studies grew, some of these charges faltered and retired. However, dialectically, other forms of opposition hopped into their place. Ironically, in some places, women's studies, once a fad, suddenly became passe. Once a flightly trollop, it became, overnight, an old crone. Both guises made women's studies an inappropriate consort for an academic patriarch. More seriously, in other places, opposition to women's studies became a feature of a larger attack on putatively "liberal culture." The warriors in this attack wear different intellectual clothing; speak in different voices. Some are social conservatives, who find women's studies a horrifying cesspool of lesbian decadence. Others are neo-conservatives, who declare that women's studies provides yet more proof that the contemporary university corruptly prefers ideology to objectivity; politics to pure thought. Peter Berger, the sociologist, whose work women's studies' practioners have often used, declares:

"There is a...division in sociology now...there are the ideologues, who see sociology as an opportunity for advocacy. Some are leftists, some are feminists, but whatever they are, they believe they have the answers before they have the questions...It seems to me that the quality of students entering sociology today is lower than it used to be. That's due mainly to the poor job market, but I think it's also due in part to the effects of the

propagandists." [23]

Such opposition is itself hardly innocent of ideological self-interest. It has expressed itself materially in the nasty fall in federal support for research about women. From 1980 to 1983, the National Institute of Education reduced grant support for research and training projects about women and minorities from $3.4 million to $168,000. From 1981 to 1983, the National Endowment for the Humanities reduced its support for projects about women from $1.89 million to $876,000. In the same years, the National Science Foundation reduced its grants about wmen from $2.3 million to $1.4 million. [24] These losses are comparatively tiny in comparison to other federal budgetary commitments -- be they to missiles, marching bands, or social security. However, because women's studies has never had much money, even a little loss of largess seem large.

During the next decade, women's studies must compensate for these lapses. We can, for example, turn to individual states for funds. However, we cannot simply accept federal slaps by turning the other cheek and organizing bake-sales. One of our political tasks is to insist upon a federal and national responsibility for the well-being of women and children, and for knowing them.

We face, then, forces that wish to efface some of our energetic deeds. They also wish to crib, cabin, and confine our energizing future. Let me, however, end as I began --with simple truths. We will face those forces down. Our celebratory presence is a tribute to our survival and to our strength. We have proven our talents for wild patience. We enjoy them now. Because these

talents will neither atrophy, nor decay, we shall use them again, and again, and celebrate them again, and again.

"Notes"

[1] Adrienne Rich, A Wild Patience Has Taken Me This Far: Poems 1978-1981 (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1981), p. 8.

[2] Florence Howe, Myths of Coeducation (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), is a collection of essays that traces the development of women's studies from the perspective of one of its pioneers. See, too, my essay, "Women as Knowers," Feminist Visions: Toward a Transformation of the Liberal Arts Curriculum, ed. Diane L. Fowlkes and Charlotte S. McClure (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1984), pp. 15-24.

[3] JoAnn M. Fritsche, Excellence and Equity: The Scholarship on Women as a Catalyst for Change in the University (Orono, Maine: University of Maine at Orono, 1985), is an excellent handbook about bringing about institutional change.

[4] Marilyn Schuster and Susan Van Dyne, "Placing Women in the Liberal Arts: Stages of Curriculum Transformation," Harvard Educational Review, 54, 4 (November 1984), 413-428, surveys and offers a theory about mainstreaming.

[5] Ibid., p. 413-14.

[6] Dorothy Smith, "A Sociology for Women," The Prism of Sex, ed. Julia A. Sherman and Evelyn Torton Beck (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), p. 169.

[7] "The Feminist Reconstruction of History," Academe, 69, 5 (September-October 1983), 28.

[8] In "Women's Time, Women's Space: Writing the History of Feminist Criticism," Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature, 3, 1/2 (Spring/Fall, 1984), 29-43, Elaine Showalter, who invented the term "gynocritics," helps to map that development.

[9] The Associate Professor is Susan Wiltshire; the university is Vanderbilt. Wiltshire told about her dream, with good humor, at a panel at a symposium about women's studies at Vanderbilt on April 20, 1985.

[10] A Room of One's Own (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1929, Harbinger edition), p. 101.

[11] See, for example, Theories of Women's Studies, ed. Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983).

[12] Harry Brod, in his paper, "The New Men's Studies: From Feminist Theory to Gender Scholarship," ms. 1984, suggests that men's studies will contribute to our understanding of gender.

[13] Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, "Ideal Images and Real Roles: The Perpetuation of Gender Inequality," Dissent, 31, 4 (Fall 1984), 441.

[14] My thanks to Professor Alison Jagger for help with the relationships between theories of sexual difference and equality.

[15] Carol Gilligan, In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982). Alice Walker, In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens (New York: Harvest Book, 1983), pp. xi-xii.

[16] I am gratefully adapting Professor Jane DeHart-Matthews, plenary speech on "Women, Tradition, and Politics," Third Annual

New Jersey Research Conference on Women, Douglass College/Rutgers University, May 21, 1985.

[17] "A Biosocial Perspective on Parenting," Daedalus (Spring 1977), 1-33. For comment, see Signs, 4, 4 (Summer 1979), 695-717.

[18] Jane Gallop, The Daughter's Seduction: Feminism and Psychoanalysis (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982), brilliantly, wittily, examines the psychoanalytic foundation of much contemporary French gender theory. Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," Signs, 5, 4 (Summer 1980), 631-656, but often reprinted, remains one of the most cogent, eloquent statements of lesbian feminist theory.

[19] Mary Hartman, "Capitalism and the Sexes," Raritan Review, 4, 1 (Summer 1984), 133, summarizes her position.

[20] I repeat these comments on theories of sexual difference in a forthcoming report from the Ford Foundation about women's studies, with Nina Kressner Cobb.

[21] The Barnard Conference, "Towards a Politics of Sexuality," 1982, whipped open the complex argument about female sexuality. Its papers are in Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality, ed. Carole S. Vance (Boston and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984. Another important text is Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality, ed. Ann Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983). Susan Rubin Suleiman, "Writing and Motherhood," The (M)other Tongue: Essays in Feminist Psychoanalytic Interpretation, ed. Shirley Nelson Garner, Claire Kahane, Madelon Sprengnether (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 352-377, lucidly surveys the

nexus of psychoanalytic theory, mothering, and language.

[22] I am indebted to Professor Cheryl Townsend Gilkes for this phrase, as well as for my remarks about black women and the church, plenary speech on "Women, Tradition, and Religion," Third Annual New Jersey Research Conference on Women, Douglass College/Rutgers University, May 21, 1985.

[23] "Sociologists Examine an Issue That's Very Close to Home," New York Times (April 28, 1985), E-7. For an intriguing example of a supporter of women's studies, and of the women's movement, who still slippingly reveals patriarchal attitudes towards them, see Lawrence Stone's review of two books of women's history, New York Review of Books, XXXII, 6 (April 21, 1985), 21-27; two corrective letters, from Mary Prior and Joan Scott, in the May 30, 1985 issue of the Review, pp. 52-53, and Stone's apology and explanation, especially to Scott, p. 53.

[24] See the Report of the Commission on New Funding Priorities, May, 1985, from the National Council for Research on Women, located at Hunter College, New York, New York 10022.